

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-2357

APRYLE SARVER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

KENNETH S. APFEL, Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Joseph H. Young, Senior District Judge. (CA-98-3870-Y)

Submitted: March 31, 2000

Decided: September 8, 2000

Before MURNAGHAN,* NIEMEYER, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

George B. Levasseur, Jr., Cumberland, Maryland, for Appellant. Lynne A. Battaglia, United States Attorney, Arthur J. Fried, General Counsel, Charlotte J. Hardnett, Principal Deputy General Counsel, John M. Sacchetti, Associate General Counsel, Jay C. Hinsley,

* Judge Murnaghan participated in the consideration of this case but died prior to the time the decision was filed. The decision is filed by a quorum of the panel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 46(d).

Office of the General Counsel, SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION,
Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See
Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Apryle Sarver appeals from the district court's order granting the Commissioner of Social Security's motion for summary judgment and affirming the denial of social security disability insurance benefits. We have thoroughly reviewed the briefs and administrative record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Sarver v. Apfel, No. CA-98-3870-Y (D. Md. Aug. 23, 1999).^{*} We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

^{*} Although the district court's order is marked as "filed" on August 20, 1999, the district court's record shows that it was entered on the docket sheet on August 23, 1999. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the judgment or order was entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).